R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 828 EF 001 644

A LOOK AT THE SCHOOLS OF TOMORROW--A SPEECH GIVEN TO THE 1ST ANNUAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS SEMINAR OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION (VAIL VILLAGE, COLO., DEC. 6-8, 1967). (TITLE SUPPLIED).

BY- ELLENA, WILLIAM
AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSN., DENVER, COLO.

PUB DATE DEC 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.84 19P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, *FOOD SERVICE WORKERS, *SOCIAL CHANGE, POPULATION TRENDS,

IN AN EFFORT TO POINT OUT FUTURE TRENDS IN EDUCATION THE SPEECH NOTES THAT THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHARACTERISTIC OF AMERICAN SOCIETY TODAY IS THE CHANGE IN THE RATE OF CHANGE--NOT CHANGE IN ARITHMETIC BUT GEOMETRIC PROPORTIONS. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF TODAY'S SOCIETY ARE--(1) WE LIVE IN AN ERA IN WHICH THE ONLY STABILITY IS SOME KIND OF STABILITY IN MOTION, (2) NEW JOBS ARE GOING UNFILLED IN SPITE OF CONTINUED UNEMPLOYMENT, (3) COMPUTERS ARE HAVING A PROFOUND EFFECT ON EDUCATION, (4) MAJOR PORTIONS OF THE WORLD ARE IN A VIOLENT STATE OF REVOLUTION, AND (5) POPULATIONS ARE SHIFTING AND INTERDEPENDENCE AMONG CITIZENS IS GREATLY INCREASING. FORERUNNERS OF FUTURE CHANGES ARE--(1) A POPULATION OF 265 MILLION PEOPLE IN 1985, (2) ABUNDANCE AND SCARCITY IN THE WORLD, (3) EFFECTS OF THE COLD WAR ON OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES, (4) AUTOMATION, (5) GROWING MILITANCY OF TEACHERS, (6) SHIFT FROM USE OF MANPOWER FOR PRODUCTION OF MATERIAL GOODS TO PRODUCTION OF SERVICE, (7) ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY, AND (8) ERADICATION OF DISEASE. PREDICTIONS ARE--(1) INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION, (2) EXTENDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNGER CHILDREN, (3) ASSUMPTION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION, (4) INCREASED SHARING OF UNIVERSITY AND LIBRARY RESOURCES, (5) INCREASED ATTENTION TO THE AVERAGE STUDENT, (6) INCREASED PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF EDUCATIONAL STAFFS, (7) RAPID OBSOLESCENCE OF TEXTBOOKS, AND (8) CHANGING CHARACTERISTICS OF BUILDING REQUIREMENTS. (BD)

ED019828

AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

1st Annual School Administrators Seminar

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

December 6 - 7 - 8, 1967

Vail Village

Colorado

EF001644

MISS MARY GRIFFIN, Director of Food Service, Newark, New Jersey: Thank you, Dr. Perryman. John just said that I was from a difficult community and no one knows better than I because at the June board meeting of the Board of Education "that Miss Griffin" was taken to task. "That Miss Griffin" had had a dinner for her employees "at which she charged $7.50. Was that her civic organization? That Miss Griffin got up and she said that she was having guests and no one could smoke or drink." With no one taking any notes, you try to remember what was said. However, I wasn't even asked to speak at the dinner. This was what was told to 400 at a public board meeting. So you know I am from a difficult community in difficult times. The day I had to refute this statement was the day of the riot in Newark this summer.

The program reads, "School Food Service Today and Tomorrow." So today we are looking into the future at tomorrow's schools. This I think will give us the challenge to know how we are planning in our own area for the years ahead as well as to evaluate what we are now doing as of December, 1967, toward the future.

Dr. William Ellena was born and had all his basic education in Minnesota before going east to Maryland to earn his doctorate and to be employed by NEA. Since 1959, he has been with the American Association of School Administrators; and since 1963, Dr. Ellena has been Associate Secretary of the Association.

Through his professional career, he has been a prolific writer in the field of school organization, public relations as well as in many other areas related to education.

I am confident that Dr. Ellena will challenge our thinking. He will make us aware of the need to make courageous decisions to help us move toward having a more significant contribution to make in the field of education. It is my pleasure to present to you Dr. William Ellena. (Applause)

DR. WILLIAM ELLENA, Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators: Dr. John, Chairman Mary, Ladies and Gentlemen, and Friends:

My assignment this morning is to talk with you about the schools of tomorrow. My assignment also is to cover at least a six-week graduate course in sixteen minutes and I don't have the slightest notion how to do that.

I cannot help but recall a little aphorism that was

written in the 18th Century by a German philosopher by the name of Georg Lichtenberg, and I think the little aphorism that he wrote characterizes school people today more than ever before. Mr. Lichtenberg said he did not know whether if things changed they would get any better. "But," he said, "I do know if they are to get any better they must change." I think there is a great deal of truth to that. As I look at the profession today, it has changed. It has changed tremendously. Your own organization has changed. I can recall, for example, that several months ago I was meeting with a superintendent of schools up in the northern all-over region of Minnesota. And we were talking late one night. He got to reminiscing just a bit and, quite frankly, he was bragging. He was bragging about what he believed to be the increasing competence of the people coming into his school system. He said, for example, that the teachers every year are almost perceptively more competent than they were the year before. Then he made two interesting little observations. He said, "You know, it wasn't always that way. For example, when I was appointed a teacher in this district thirty-nine years ago, by golly, I was on tenure before I knew that Sodom and Gomorrah were man and wife. And if you think that's bad, they made me a superintendent before I realized that the Epistles weren't the wives of the Apostles."

My assignment is to talk with you about the schools of tomorrow and, obviously, all I can do is to share with you some of the perceptions that I have. I don't ask that you swallow them; I ask only that you chew on them a bit. Remember they are my perceptions.

In preparing for this assignment, almost by accident I came across a little book written about two and a half years ago by the senior senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright, and the little book was entitled, "Old Myths and New Realities". Of course, it was a compilation of what Mr. Fulbright considered to be some of the more significant speeches that he had given on the floor of the Senate within the past several years. It pertained to foreign policy, of course. In reading that little document, I could not help thinking about some of the more profound implications for public education, for teaching, for children, and for the way in which children learn. Mr. Fulbright said that there seems to be an inevitable divergence, attributable perhaps to the imperfections of the human mind, between the world as it really is and the world as it has been perceived. Then he went on to say, "As long as the perceptions that we have are reasonably close to reality, then we can proceed in a rational and in an appropriate manner." Then he made this caution: "But when our perceptions fail to keep pace with reality, regardless of the reason, whether it is simply because we do not

know or whether it is because something is startlingly unfamiliar or whether it just happens to displease us--it doesn't matter, then a great gap exists between reality and perception." And if a great gap exists there, then most of the action that we take becomes irrational and irrelevant.

I guess that is what Pogo was talking about three and a half years ago. He had had a particularly trying day in the swamp. (All of you people being widely read and sociologically oriented are familiar with Pogo, I am sure.) But he had had a particularly trying day and the last picture in that series of cartoons is one that I shall not soon forget. Pogo was sitting on the edge of a log, head in hand, and he was making this observation. He said, "We have met the enemy and he's us." And there is a good deal of truth to that, particularly in this whole area of change.

About a year or so ago, someone asked Margaret Mead, the famed anthropologist-sociologist, what in her opinion was the single, most significant characteristic of the American society today. Old Margaret Mead, who is just about the fastest gun in the West, didn't bat an eye and she said it was the change in the rate of change--the kind of thing that John Perryman was referring to this morning. Mind you, not just change now, but change in the rate of change. Once you change the rate, then you bring about change in geometric proportions not arithmetic proportions. So I would suggest to you that we are on the verge of change unlike any human being any place in the world has ever experienced before. It's going to happen fast, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to take just a few moments and heed Mr. Fulbright's advice and that of Margaret Mead. Before talking about schools of tomorrow, I would like to talk about the society of tomorrow because I think unless we have some perception of what that society is and the characteristics that that society will have, it is rather foolhardy to talk about the kinds of schools that we are going to have created to serve that society.

Let's take a look for just a moment or two at some of the characteristics of our society today. Mind you now, no guessing, no speculation, no forecasting. I do this because I think there are a great many people whose perceptions are not compatible with reality as of now. For example, of all of the money that has been spent in the total history of the United States for research and development, more than one-half of it has been spent in the last eight years with foreseeable kinds of consequences.

Look, too, at the fact that we live in an era in which the only stability that we can possibly have is some kind of stability in motion. I am not trying to play games with words. It sounds like a contradiction. What I am saying is that the only stability that anyone can have in the kind of work they are doing or in an organization is the kind of stability that is possible in some kind of a flexible, moving, dynamic structure. The static stability is a thing of the past. It served well at one time, but it will not serve us any longer. If you accept that, then I would suggest to you that this places undreamed of burdens on the public schools of this country. It places undreamed of burdens simply because if schools are to exercise the leadership responsibilities with the school people that have been given to them, they can only do it so long as the schools are in tune with the times, and the times have been described as revolutionary to say the least.

Look, for example, at the kind of situation you find in any major metropolitan newspaper in this country on any weekend in any part of the United States. Look in the want ad section and you will find jobs that were totally unknown three to seven years ago. Some of them almost defy pronunciation. I am talking about the kinds of jobs that are described as gyrodynamics, ferrous reconnaissance, transistorized circuitry, microminiaturization. The list goes on and on, and these jobs are going beginning in this country today. They are going begging because of the lack of skills, and this in spite of the fact that we have had a persistent unemployment problem for a long time.

I would like to talk to you, too, about what is going on right today in the whole field of computers. This is going to have a profound impact on education in this country. Suffice it to say that computers today are literally one thousand times faster than they were three years ago.

Look, too, at the fact that even a casual observation of today's newspapers in almost any part of this country reveals that major portions of the world are in a violent state of revolution and this has caused a great many Americans to become insecure. In fact, it has caused some of them to become downright frightened and understandably so. Perhaps unfortunately, this has occurred at the same time that we have witnessed an upsurge of nationalism that is rampant in a great many of the colonial and undeveloped nations of the world. Here we have massive land areas, such as Africa, where people are demanding for the first time that the world provide them with a reasonable amount of food, shelter and opportunities. I have seen African mothers and fathers who, up until now, didn't really believe

that education was important. But they believe it now and they know that if that little colored child of theirs is going to have any kind of opportunity other than what they have had and which has provided them with bitter frustration, it is going to be possible only if that child is educated. So they are demanding that he be educated and they are demanding it now. There are countries in the world today that are spending more than 30% of their gross national product on education--a fantastic outlay! And they are impatient. The period of expectancy is shortening. They are very impatient and we have a great deal of responsibility for this. After all, it is primarily we who have been trying to tell them for a long time that education is important. They didn't believe it, but they believe it now and they are demanding it.

Look, too, at the shifting population that we have in these United States which is unlike anything any other nation has ever experienced.

Look, too, at the interdependence that we have among all of our citizens which has come about in great part because of instantaneous communication and very, very rapid transportation, and you are going to witness some great breakthroughs in both of those within just a couple years.

Look, too, at the fact that we have an economy in this country that is no longer local in nature and hasn't been for a long, long time.

I would suggest to you that these things and dozens of others that could be mentioned are nothing more than mere forerunners of the dynamic changes that you are going to see in the years ahead. Let me suggest just a few.

Ladies and gentlemen, in America alone, by the year 1985--and that is not very far from now--we are going to have 265 million people and five out of every six are going to live in a megalopolis of one kind or another. 265 million people if the birth rate continues to decline as it has for the last nine consecutive years! If it levels off or begins to increase, Lord knows how many people we are going to have! Just imagine the problems that a nation has with 265 million people--the problem you have in bringing about involvement in government, the problem you have in communicating with people. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, there is a very serious question as to whether our form of government as we know it is adequate for a population of that size, for a society that is technologically and scientifically sophisticated. It has never been tried and the burden for making it work or the burden for making whatever changes are

necessary is going to fall on the public schools primarily.

Look, too, at some other things. Here in this country we have abundance and scarcity stalking side by side--a paradox to say the least. As I mentioned earlier, those people who do not have are now demanding that they have. And how long did we go on in this nation with the disparity between the haves and the have-nots? Incidentally, the disparity is increasing rather than decreasing, and this is true throughout the world. I would only submit to you: How great can the disparity become before those who do not have have nothing to lose in trying to take a little bit from those who do have? I have heard people complain bitterly about the massive giveaway program of the Federal Government. I am referring to our foreign aid program. Do you know how much our foreign aid program amounts to? If you grouped together every conceivable form of foreign aid we have in this nation, with the exception of the military, we are devoting six-tenths of 1% of our gross national product to it. Is that a reasonable commitment?

Look, too, at the Cold War that we have in this country--a Cold War that we have had for about twenty-one years. It has been with us so long we have almost become immune to it. Just think, we have youngsters who were born, went to elementary school, secondary school and graduated from college and they have never known anything but a Cold War. I would suggest to you that that Cold War had some very profound influences on the American people. In fact, it has almost brought about an inversion in our priorities because the Cold War has consumed money, time and talent which might have been used to build school buildings; money, time and talent that might have been used to build hospitals; money, time and talent that just might have been used to remove some of the blight of ugliness that afflicts most of our metropolitan areas and almost all of our highways; money, time and talent that just might have been used to remove some of the poverty that continues to afflict one-fifth of the American population, incidentally 80% of whom are white.

I would suggest to you that up until about two years ago the Cold War has placed an extremely high premium on innovation and, consequently, we have paid the price. We paid the price because there are people in high position, influential people with the very best of motives (Incidentally, I am not questioning motives), who believe that during a period of external challenge we cannot afford to have domestic division at home. Innovated programs always bring about domestic division. Innovated programs always cost money and we have paid the price.

Look, too, at what is going to happen in this country

in the whole field of automation in the next few years. There are going to be some tremendous changes, not all of them anticipated at the moment by most Americans. For example, ever since 1954 when the Supreme Court ruled on the Brown decision (Incidentally, I am using this only to fix a period of time. I do not want to suggest in any way a cause and effect relationship in terms of what I am going to talk about), the employment opportunities for Negroes in America have been decreasing--not only decreasing but decreasing at an accelerating rate. The reason is primarily twofold: inadequate education and automation. The factory jobs and the service jobs, the jobs that at least up until now have provided the Negro with his primary source of employment, are also precisely the same jobs that are being eliminated by automation at the estimated rate of 30,000-40,000 per week.

Look, too, at the changing relationships between teachers and administrators. I would like to spend three or four hours on that and I can't. Look at the militancy, the aggressiveness, the increased competence. A strange thing is happening. Here we have a society that is activist oriented. Here we have a society that is more assured than ever before. Here we have a teaching profession that is more competent than ever before. Here we have school administrators who are more democratic than ever before. Here are all kinds of things that would suggest that relationships ought to be getting better and, instead, all hell has broken loose--or so it seems. I think in the long run this is going to be a wonderful thing, but it is going to be painful for a period of time and it is going to be a headache until the school administrators learn how to adapt the leadership roles to this new condition. And it's going to be a headache, too, until the teachers in this country, through their organizations, gain a good deal more maturity in the use of the instruments they now have and also a willingness to accept the kinds of responsibility commensurate with the demands that they are making.

I would suggest to you also that within the next few years you are going to see the American people developing to the point where they are going to begin placing much more value on such things as art, literature, drama, music, and education and health services. I think we see much of this coming already. The eternal search for material goods, which for all practical purposes are already in abundance, is going to diminish and thus remove the old fears of survival. If that happens, the American people are going to establish new priorities and more citizens are going to begin to demand much more in the way of services. And if that happens, then you can look for a condition whereby large blocs of manpower will be shifted from the production of

material goods to the production of services or the rendering of cultural, aesthetic or spiritual help to our people. And if that happens, you can look forward to a great increase in the number of professions in this country.

Look, too, at another condition. I refer here to ethnic and religious diversity of which Americans have always felt they had a reasonably abundant share. I would suggest to you that the problem we have had in this nation in this area, the problem of developing a genuine understanding and respect between and among the Catholic, the Jew and the Protestant, is a pretty simple problem, at least compared to the problems we are going to have; because within less than ten years there will be millions of Americans who will daily come into contact with Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, and followers of a dozen other great religions. And the burden here, too, is going to be placed on the public schools.

And look at the economic interdependence we have. Look at the greatly improved communications system we have. Look at what has been happening in the field of rapid transportation. I would suggest to you that they are all forerunners and they are telling you that the small community is going to die and that every small community in America (I am talking about a community now in the sociological context, not a bedroom community) is going to get either much, much larger or it is going to disappear. That shouldn't shock you. It has been going on in this country for a long, long time.

Look, too, at some of the reports now emanating from the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland. Doctors are notoriously conservative, perhaps among the most conservative people I have ever met in my life as a group. Yet a strange thing is beginning to happen. Teams of physicians working at NIH are now saying that within ten years most of the diseases commonly known to man will be eradicated and that perhaps psychiatry will come into its own. There is a very real possibility now, based on available data, that children born with seeming mental handicaps can be made to respond to treatment to the extent that they can be brought back to normality. What a marvelous thing this would be!

I would suggest to you that the kind of society that I am describing literally demands that teams of people work as opposed to individuals, simply to bring about the galaxy of skills that are necessary, and this is going to apply to your organization as well as the one that I represent and for whom I work.

I think, too, that we are going to see in this country

within the next very few years that television is going to become such a significant, powerful force in the formation of public opinion, in the dissemination of information and, for that matter, in the education of children that the public itself is going to demand a far greater voice in the control of television. You already see this beginning to happen. It was my pleasure to watch Mr. Johnson sign the Public Broadcasting Act about two weeks ago. This is going to create a fourth network--a public network. Just think for a moment how happy you would be if ABC, NBC and CBS were owned by the John Birch Society. Pick your own society; I don't care. I'm not picking on the John Burchers. It could happen and I don't think the American people can afford to let it happen, and I don't think they will.

Let me suggest to you some of the kinds of things that are going to happen in terms of the way in which we organize and administrate food, the way in which children learn and the way in which teachers teach in the next few years. I think we can anticipate, without any doubt, that there will be a great increase in the number of organizations created by men through which they attempt to influence public policy. I think we can look forward to vastly increased expenditures by colleges and universities on the in-service education of people, perhaps as much as they are spending right now on pre-service preparation.

I think, too, that we can look forward to the day--and we are beginning to see some of these things--when the school people will recognize and become aware of their responsibility for the education of children ages three, four and five. I think we can look forward to the time in the next few years when we are going to have a free public education system in this country which extends at least two years beyond what we now think of as the high school, and those two years will provide an appropriate education for all children.

I think, too, that we can look forward to the fact that in this country I believe we are going to see a complete reversal of the tax base for financing public education. I think within a relatively few years we will begin to see the Federal Government assuming primary responsibility for financing public education, this, in turn, supplemented by the state and that, in turn, supplemented by the local. I would suggest to you that you consider for a moment the implications of this for local control. And I am suggesting just the reverse, I think, of what most of you are thinking. I am saying that this may be the only way by which we will ever have any local control of any consequence. We don't have any now to speak of. There hasn't been any local control for a long, long time. What can a school board decide? Can they decide whom to employ? No. Can they

decide what to teach? No. Can they decide how many days they are even going to run school? No. They can only do all of these things within a parameter that has been created by other legal bodies which people, in turn, have created. They can't even decide how to spend their money because they need all they've got to pay for math, science and foreign language. There isn't any money left in most communities over which a board of education can exercise any discretion. Once the Federal Government begins to assume the primary responsibility, then I would suggest to you that the board of education will indeed have some resources over which it has discretion and at that point we will begin to experience local control.

I think, too, that we can look forward to a great increase in the sharing that exists between and among universities within the next few years. I think this will involve not only the sharing of faculty and the sharing of students but the sharing of library resources as well. For example, I ran across an interesting thing in the State of Mississippi not long ago. Four institutions of higher education in Mississippi and one in the State of Louisiana have combined their libraries electronically. It is referred to as LDX which I understand stands for Long Distance Xerography. A fascinating thing takes place now. A student at any one of those five institutions, in a matter of moments, can find out whether the volume he is seeking is located at any one of the five institutions and in less than thirty minutes can get a print-out of the volume regardless of whether it is at the source from which the request is made. Just think for a moment what this means for public schools. Think of what it means for school libraries.

We have done a pretty silly thing in this country, simply because there was no better way to do it. Just think how many magazines we store in libraries. The formula that a commercial publisher uses is 40% content and 60% commercial. We stored all of them. We have more commercial material stored in libraries than we will ever know what to do with simply because we have had no way to separate the two up until now. Now we do, and I would suggest to you that this is one area in which you are going to see some fantastic changes.

I really got this idea from Harold Spears who, up until June, was the Superintendent of Schools in San Francisco, California. Harold was giving a speech one day and he said, "You know, this is not the day of the average in the American public schools. It's the period of the different, the period of the exceptions, the period of distinctions. If you are an average child, you can't get much attention in an American school today. Oh, you can get a reasonably good education, but you

can't get much attention." Harold went on to say that perhaps there is nothing more humiliating than to be an average student with an IQ of around 100 who gets his lessons done on time, causes no disturbance, has a girl friend, isn't in an honors course, has never been down to the principal's office, doesn't want a part-time job, isn't asking for his rights, goes out for football instead of a merit scholarship, doesn't even know he needs a counselor. He said perhaps there is nothing more humiliating than that. "But," Harold said, "here we can anticipate great change in the very few years ahead. Almost any day now, the average student in the American public school is going to be discovered and when he is he is going to lose his anonymity. But, in turn, for losing his anonymity, he is going to inherit a rich legacy of public funds." I think this is going to be one of the great changes that we are going to witness within the next few years in this land of ours.

I think, too, that within a decade or so, we are going to see some strange things happen. Remember I am describing a condition that is characterized by a change in the rate of change. It may have taken forty years to do some of these things before, but it will not take that long again. And I suggest to you that within a decade it is going to be very, very common for teachers in this country to have Thursdays off for thinking--and I am serious. I don't care whether it's Thursday or Tuesday. I don't even care whether it's a half of Monday and a half of Friday. But they are going to have time off to think about what they have been doing, time to kick off their shoes, losen their girdles and dream a little bit. Administrators are going to experience the same thing. If you think this is far-fetched, I can identify a school system that literally has been doing this for the last sixteen years. You see, you can't get much of a return if you are going to try to buy cheaper toilet paper. That doesn't save enough money in the school budget. After all, some place typically between 65-85% of the budget is the staff. That is where the money is and that is the only place you are going to get massive dividends. So I would suggest that Thursdays off for thinking is not really very far-fetched at all.

I would suggest, too, that we have in this country what I believe to be the finest educational system ever created by man. I also think it has some shortcomings. If someone were to ask me what were one or two of the most significant shortcomings, I think I would say that the two that readily come to mind are that we start too late and we stop too soon.

Martin Deutsch, who has probably done more longitudinal research on the culturally disadvantaged child than any other person in this country, is now saying almost unequivocally that

most of the problems that afflict the hard-core unemployed in America afflict the child between the ages of two and five. And Ben and Sophie Bluhm at the University of Chicago, through their "Half-Light Research" (Incidentally, if you haven't read it, you have some homework to do), are now saying, "The typical American child attains 50% of his maximum, academic attainment by age eight." If this is true, I think it rates a very serious question as to whether or not we can continue to afford to ignore this vast opportunity in the early years that up until now we have indeed ignored.

I think, too, we can look forward to vastly increased professional competence on the part of our teaching staff and our administrative staff. The standards of preparation in the teaching profession have risen phenomenally ever sinc e 1945 and I think they will continue to increase. Perhaps most significantly, first, the period of preparation is undoubtedly going to be longer. But I think of far more significance than that, in my opinion, there will be a depth of scholarship that characterizes the total program that we now find in only a handful of institutions.

I would suggest, too, and I think you would agree, that in a great many areas major portions of textbooks become obsolete in as few as five to seven years. I would suggest to you that the productive life of the teacher is about the same as that of a used automobile. In five to seven years, they have had it. In fact, if there were some way to assess it, and I know of no way, I believe the cost to society would be less if after five years we took every single teacher out of the classroom, retired her for life and never permitted her to return unless something happened during the five years. This is the point I am trying to make. I think we are going to see in-service education activities for all members of the school system staff unlike anything we have ever seen before, simply because we must. It is not going to be thirty minutes after school on Friday. It is not going to be that kind of thing at all.

I would suggest to you that perhaps the first real breakthrough in this area is the Education Professions Development Act that Congress passed this year. It wasn't funded this year. The law was passed, but no appropriations were made. The appropriations were withheld simply because the U.S. Office of Education asked them not to appropriate the money until they had time to work out reasonable guidelines. In Fiscal 1969, money will be appropriated for the Education Professions Development Act. Chances are it will be beginning at a rate of approximately $90 million. This is the first major breakthrough in in-service education for all members of the school district staff.

I would like to suggest to you that of all the jobs held by Americans today more than half of them did not exist forty years ago. And I would suggest that the kinds of changes that we are going to see in the next decade are going to be equally violent at least. And it seems to me that our educational system gives far too little attention to this. We give far too little attention, in my opinion, to the re-education of our people. I am not talking just about teachers now nor just about children. I am talking about electricians, dentists, bookkeepers, school board members--you name it. I think what we are going to have in the future in this land of ours is a school building, if you will, that operates something like a gas station and it's going to be open all day and all night. When your tank is dry, you come in and get gas. If you want half a tank, you get half a tank; if you want a full tank, you get a full tank. It takes a little longer. If you want a dollar's worth, you get a dollar's worth. I think this is going to characterize the school system in the future.

I think, too, that we are going to take a pretty serious look at what up until now has been primarily a logistic problem. There are about three things involved in educating a child: you have the child, of course; you have the teacher of one kind or another; and you have a building. In this country, we have always assumed that the building is fixed and you move the other two. There is no reason to do it that way at all. Perhaps we are going to begin to move some other elements of those three.

And I would suggest to you that in the days ahead, a school, for example, that is built to accommodate 600 children won't have room for 600. There will only be room for about 400, because at least a third of them aren't going to be there. They are going to be out some place else participating in other kinds of activities, other kinds of experiences. It won't always be the same one-third. They are going to be coming and they are going to be going. There is no sense to continue on this philosophy that all education has to be characterized by a 2 x 4. There are some teachers who believe that the only education you can possibly have is this 2 x 4--between the two covers of the book and the four walls of the classroom. It never did make much sense. I would suggest that there would be some great changes there.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to continue, but my time is up and I thank you very much for yours. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you, Dr. Ellena.

We are sorry to say that Dr. Ellena is leaving us soon, but you may have ten minutes now to question him.

MR. CHARLES TUTT, Walled Lake, Michigan: Doctor, you made the statement that a school board does not have the opportunity to choose whom they employ. Can you elaborate on that?

DR. ELLENA: Yes. All I was referring to is that the profession itself has set standards that determine the pool from which they must select. For example, they can't go out and take a high school youngster and put him in the classroom--at least not in most states.

MISS CRONAN: Dr. Ellena, you said that when and if the time comes that the Federal will take over the financing of the schools, the local districts will have more discretionary power. Would you please explain that just a little?

DR. ELLENA: The point I was trying to make was that more and more boards of education today have less and less money over which they have any control. This comes about simply because the money of the United States has fled the local community. It is no longer there. About four years ago in this country, somewhere in excess of 70% of all of the wealth in the nation was in property, and we built the public school system funded in great part on property tax. That is not where the wealth is any more. The Census Bureau reports that last year 71¢ out of each dollar collected for taxes in this country on all levels and for all purposes was collected by the Federal Government. They have the most efficient tax-collecting machinery you have ever seen in your life, and I think you know it. The point I was trying to make was that the board of education in the typical, local school district in this country no longer has access to the wealth because it isn't there. And since it doesn't have access to wealth, it has little in the way of discretionary power over the resources it has to invest. Once they are relieved of this massive burden of funding a minimum foundation program for all the children, then perhaps they will begin to exercise some real discretionary power over the resources they do have, even though they are limited.

There were so many things I would have liked to have touched upon, but time didn't permit.

DR. ELLIS S. McALLISTER, Assistant Superintendent, Ogden City Schools, Utah: In regard to the increased support of funds from the Federal Government, what implications does this have for federal control for the centralized system of education? Does it mean that the state will not be the basis of

our operation of education over this nation?

DR. ELLENA: In my opinion, for the foreseeable future, the states will retain the legal and primary function for the operation of public education. This will not preclude what I believe will be an increase in federal control. Surely there will be controls attached to the dollar. There doesn't have to be, but there always have been, probably always will be. In my opinion, that is not all bad. I believe that in many areas federal control would be eminently desirable, just so long as they keep their cotton-picking fingers out of the curriculum. But if you are talking about standards or teacher preparation, if you are talking about minimum salary schedules, if you are talking about safety standards for school buildings, I think these are areas where federal control, at least some, would be desirable.

So although I would foresee the day, at least for the next ten to thirty years or so, where the state will retain the primary responsibility, they will not have the primary responsibility for providing the funds.

DR. McALLISTER: There are those who say we will move this to have the Federal Government control the textbooks and the content. Of course, you mentioned that you hoped that this wouldn't be getting into the area of curriculum.

DR. ELLENA: Some people operate on the assumption that we don't have it now and we don't want it. I would suggest to you that we have had a whole lot of federal control for a long time. For example, the new biology. Who do you think paid for that? The new physics, the new math. These were all National Science Foundation projects. NSF is the Federal Government. But it was it wasn't controlled by the politics of Federal Government (and I think "controlled" is the wrong word); it was brought about by the infusion of federal funds in the hands of professionally competent scholars. And I think this kind of thing will continue. At one time, we all knew what Mr. Paul Morton referred to as "that fifty-year lag" between the inception of an idea and its practice in most places. This was true, but it is not true any more. For example, the new physics came into being in 1959. This year, at least 75% of all children taking physics in America are taking the new physics--PSSE. So it doesn't take that long any more. But I think the Federal Government will extend its arms into the curriculum area in that way.

MR. V. L. GIBBS, Business Manager, David Douglas Public Schools, Portland, Oregon: Dr. Ellena, you made a comment

with regard to the five-year period that teachers ought to teach. I tend to agree with you, but my question has to do with the stand that the American Association would take with regard to teacher tenure. This seems to me to be the one place where we have problems of eliminating from our classrooms those people who do the things that are needed.

DR. ELLENA: I think you are right. You put your finger on a real problem. But I would anticipate some great changes here. Of course, I was being somewhat facetious when I suggested throwing out all the teachers after five years. The point I was really trying to make was that there are going to be some tremendous changes in the in-service education of a teacher. The assumption is that, in effect, once a teacher is prepared, after four years in almost any kind of college at all, she is tuned up for life. We know that isn't true. I think we are going to see some breakthroughs in this whole area of teacher tenure, and I think professional negotiation, collective bargaining, call it what you will, is going to be the foot in the door. A lot of teachers don't realize yet that when you negotiate both parties have the option of putting items on the agenda.

I think the single salary schedule is going to go the way of the dodo bird through negotiation. I think teacher tenure will go the same way. There will be some means developed by the profession itself, I think, within each school district or at the state level that will provide some reasonable measure of competence, and that will replace teacher tenure. In my opinion, teacher tenure was desperately needed at one time when teachers were subject to the whim and fancy of all kinds of petty politicians. But for all practical purposes, that day has passed and the profession is strong enough now that it can come to the defense of its members when they are unjustly treated.

So although it is a problem at the present time, I think teacher tenure, single salary schedule and a whole lot of other things that up until now have been sacred cows are going to go out the door.

MISS JOSEPHINE MARTIN, Chief Consultant, School Food Service Program, Atlanta, Georgia: Mine is a vested interest question. You mentioned a number of things that had implications of school food service. One was the trend toward the year-round, all day, comprehensive schools for students of all ages from three to beyond the normal high school age. You also mentioned more participation of the Federal Government in financing the total educational program. My question is: With all the implications of these things, how do the professional school food service people get in on the ground level in helping to

set the standards of nutrition in this kind of program? The very fact that our federal financing comes primarily from the USDA sometimes makes it difficult for school food service to be included in the overall financing of educational programs. I would like your comments.

DR. ELLENA: Josephine, I don't have very many, simply because I don't know. I would have a few guesses though. I think education has operated in a political arena for a long, long time and will continue to do so. I think the people who say we have to keep politics out of education are naive. I think we must do all we can to keep partisan politics out of education. But education had better be in the political arena because that's what it is.

I think, too, that the ASFSA, for example, as the total Association, is going to have to become more sensitive to the political realities that exist in Washington. For example, I have witnessed organizations that communicate with their congressmen from time to time on a piece of legislation that is being debated. This is desirable. Then the legislation is passed and then the people sit back and say, "Wonderful! We've got it." Josephine, at that point you don't have anything until the Appropriations Committee gives you some money. I think few associations have been sensitive to the realities of Congress. Any association that is not conversant with every single member of the Appropriations Committee is not really on its toes, because without them you are not going to get a thing.

So I guess all I am saying is that,at least for that portion of the dollar that is going to come from Washington, you had better become very, very conversant with and sensitive to the political realities of who controls what. It is not enough just to have a piece of legislation passed. You need that, but that is just the first step and that's all.

MR. TUTT: Doctor, I would like to ask you: With the change in society that you foresee, do you foresee a more specialized and more highly trained food service personnel, more to the education of value of food service, or do you see more of the simpler, streamlined food service, more or less as a provision of food for the child in the school building of the future?

DR. ELLENA: This is sheer, personal speculation, but I think for the immediate future, from five to ten years, that two different kinds of things will happen. Some schools will get into, for all practical purposes, what is nothing more than a mass feeding exercise. At the same time, other school

systems will develop vastly more significant educational programs associated with the nutritional program. Now I think what is going to make the difference as to why one district goes one way and the other goes another is going to be the quality of the personnel in the school food service program in that district. Where they are weak, they are going to go by the boards, in my opinion, and where they are strong they are going to get stronger--much stronger. This, I would assume and hope would be one of the major responsibilities that ASFSA itself would incur. So I think in a lot of places the decision is yet to be made, but once made it is awfully hard to reverse it.

I am staying out of school building intentionally, because you have a specialist coming up soon.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: There is time for one more. Any others? Thank you again, Dr. Ellena, for sharing all your ideas with us and giving us so much to think about.

Some good always comes out of everything. People in this audience who know me know that I have many strong convictions. Sometimes they get in my way. One of them is that we should never have large dining rooms. They certainly do not lend themselves to gracious living, only to prisonlike feeding, as far as I am concerned. But we have never been able to convince the powers that be that this is a good idea. We have gotten the kitchens we wanted, we have gotten the equipment we wanted, and we have gone a long way. But until the happening of this summer, the school authorities never listened to us. One of the first recommendations after a happening in a school recently is that for a school lunchroom that held 700 students (and this is their idea now) we must have small dining rooms that don't feed over 100 or 125. So they have one happy school lunch director, because all our future planning--even those plans on the board--has been changed to meet this. It is no longer safe for the students after eight of them from that dining room were taken to the hospital. With two girls fighting over one chair in 700, we had a five-day happening.

So we are going to talk about school buildings now. Mr. Donald Burr of Tacoma, Washington, is a graduate of the University of Cincinnati, School of Architecture, and, which is most important, is on the National Committee of the American Institute of Architects in the School and College Division which has been most influential in the building of schools throughout the nation at all levels.

I think it is particularly important for us to know that he calls himself a "shirt-sleeve architect" in that he has